

DECOMPOSABLE TERNARY CUBICS

JAYDEEP V. CHIPALKATTI

Cubic forms in three variables are parametrised by points of a projective space $\mathbb{P}^9$. We study the subvarieties in this space defined by decomposable forms. Specifically, we calculate their equivariant minimal resolutions and describe their ideals invariant-theoretically.

AMS subject classification: 14-04, 14L35.

Let F be a nonzero cubic form in variables x_1, x_2, x_3 , written as follows:

$$F = a_0 x_1^3 + a_1 x_1^2 x_2 + \cdots + a_9 x_3^3, \quad a_0, \dots, a_9 \in \mathbf{C}. \quad (0.1)$$

We identify F with the point $[a_0, \dots, a_9] \in \mathbb{P}^9$ and denote the homogeneous coordinate ring of $\mathbb{P}^9$ with $\mathbf{C}[a_0, \dots, a_9]$. Now consider the set of those F which factor as a product of a quadratic and a linear form, i.e., let

$$X_\emptyset = \{F \in \mathbb{P}^9 : F = Q.L \text{ for some forms } Q, L \text{ of degrees } 2, 1\}.$$

This is a projective subvariety of $\mathbb{P}^9$. The group $SL_3(\mathbf{C})$ acts on $\mathbb{P}^9$ as follows: given a matrix $A \in SL_3$, introduce new variables $[x'_1, x'_2, x'_3] = [x_1, x_2, x_3]A$, and define $a'_0, \dots, a'_9$ by forcing the identity

$$a_0 x_1^3 + a_1 x_1^2 x_2 + \cdots + a_9 x_3^3 = a'_0 x_1'^3 + a'_1 x_1'^2 x_2' + \cdots + a'_9 x_3'^3.$$

Then $[a_0, \dots, a_9] \xrightarrow{A} [a'_0, \dots, a'_9]$. The imbedding $X_\emptyset \subseteq \mathbb{P}^9$ is thus $SL_3(\mathbf{C})$ -equivariant. Hence $I_{X_\emptyset} < \mathbf{C}[a_0, \dots, a_9]$ is a representation of SL_3 , and so are all the syzygy modules in the minimal resolution of $I_{X_\emptyset}$.

There are different possible factorisations of F , leading to five similarly defined varieties:

$$\begin{aligned} X_\equiv &= \{F \in \mathbb{P}^9 : F = L^3 \text{ for a linear form } L\}, \\ X_\neq &= \{F \in \mathbb{P}^9 : F = L_1^2 L_2 \text{ for some } L_i\}, \\ X_\Delta &= \{F \in \mathbb{P}^9 : F = L_1 L_2 L_3 \text{ for some } L_i\}, \end{aligned}$$

and the loci $X_{\bigcirc}, X_Y$ defined as Zariski closures

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\bigcirc} &= \{F \in \mathbb{P}^9 : F = Q.L \text{ where the conic } Q = 0 \text{ is smooth and} \\ &\quad \text{tangent to the line } L = 0\}, \\ X_Y &= \{F \in \mathbb{P}^9 : F = L_1 L_2 L_3 \text{ where } L_i = 0 \text{ are concurrent lines}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (0.2)$$

All the loci are irreducible, and there are inclusions

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X_{\equiv}^{(2)} & \longrightarrow & X_{\neq}^{(4)} & \longrightarrow & X_Y^{(5)} & \longrightarrow & X_{\Delta}^{(6)} \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & & & X_{\bigcirc}^{(6)} & \longrightarrow & X_{\emptyset}^{(7)} \end{array}$$

The superscripts indicate dimensions. Consider the following two problems:

- (I) calculating the SL_3 -equivariant minimal resolution for each variety X , and
- (II) expressing the minimal set of generators of I_X (i.e., the degree zero syzygies), in the language of classical invariant theory.

Problem II, in a slightly weaker form, is of classical origin. A priori, we are looking for a finite set of concomitants of F , such that their vanishing is a necessary and sufficient condition for F to lie in X . Describing such a set is tantamount to describing I_X upto its radical.

This is an instance of the general philosophy that for a form F (of any degree in any number of variables), any property which is invariant under a linear change of variables (e.g., decomposability, existence of singular points, expressibility as a sum of a specified number of powers of linear forms) should be characterisable by the vanishing (or non-vanishing) of certain concomitants of F . Classical literature on invariant theory contains a very large number of results along these lines—see e.g. [6, 10, 18, 21] or the collected papers of Cayley and Clebsch. Salmon’s book [19] is an excellent reference for the classical theory of plane curves and connections to invariant theory. Its chapter V is entirely devoted to ternary cubics. For newer (i.e. post-Hilbert) directions in invariant theory, see [1, 14, 22].

Problem I is a natural generalisation of II, but certainly more modern. In this paper we solve problem I, and then interpret the representations corresponding to the ideal generators as concomitants of ternary cubics.

Some of our varieties have alternate descriptions, e.g., $X_{\equiv}$ is the cubic Veronese imbedding of $\mathbb{P}^2$ and X_Y is a rank variety in the sense of Porras [17]. As such, the minimal systems of ideal generators for them are known. The standard equations defining the Veronese are given in [12, p. 23], but not in invariant-theoretic language. We will describe Porras's deduction of the minimal resolution of X_Y in §7. In the book referred to above, Salmon deduces sets of equations describing the varieties X_{Δ} and $X_{\emptyset}$ set-theoretically. Our calculations confirm that these equations generate the ideal I_X in each case.

The next section contains background material on representation theory. For each of the loci X , we find the ideal I_X and its Betti numbers using a machine computation. Then we identify the syzygy modules as SL_3 -representations using the hypercohomology spectral sequence, together with algebraic considerations specific to each X . In the last section, we write down the concomitants corresponding to the ideal generators.

This paper was inspired by the *Weltanschauung* of [8] (especially §11.3, §13.4), and also by Salmon's wonderful book [19]. The program Macaulay-2 has been of immense help in the computations, and it is a pleasure to thank its authors Daniel Grayson and Michael Stillman. I thank the referee for helpful observations and Anthony V. Geramita, Leslie Roberts and the Queen's University for financial assistance during the course of this work.

1. PRELIMINARIES

The purpose of this section is to establish notation and state the working definitions, all of which are phrased in invariant-theoretic terms. I have written somewhat expansively, in the hope that the framework introduced here may have more general application.

Let V be a three dimensional $\mathbf{C}$ -vector space. All representations considered henceforth are for the group $SL(V)$. (See [7, 8, 20] for the theory.) For a pair (m, n) of nonnegative integers, we have the Schur module $S_{m+n,n} = S_{m+n,n}(V)$, with the convention that $S_m = S_{m,0} = \text{Sym}^m(V)$ and $S_{1,1} = \wedge^2 V$. Note the isomorphism¹ $S_{m+n,n}^* = S_{m+n,m}$ and the formula

$$\dim S_{m+n,n} = \frac{1}{2}(m+1)(n+1)(m+n+2). \quad (1.1)$$

¹Henceforth '=' means an isomorphism of SL -modules.

In the sequel, we frequently need to decompose the tensor product $S_{m_1+n_1, n_1} \otimes S_{m_2+n_2, n_2}$ and the plethysm $S_\lambda(S_{m+n, n})$ as direct sums of irreducible representations. The former is governed by the Littlewood-Richardson rule and the latter by formulae (A.5), (A.21) in [8, appendix A]. This was programmed in Maple by the author.²

Let $\underline{x} = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ be a basis of V^* . The identification $\wedge^2 V^* = V$ gives a basis $\underline{u} = \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$ of V , where

$$u_1 = x_2 \wedge x_3, \quad u_2 = x_3 \wedge x_1, \quad u_3 = x_1 \wedge x_2. \quad (1.2)$$

If a_r appears as the coefficient of $x_1^{i_1} x_2^{i_2} x_3^{i_3}$ in (0.1), redefine a_r to be $u_1^{i_1} u_2^{i_2} u_3^{i_3}$. Thus $\underline{a} = \{a_0, \dots, a_9\}$ is a basis of S_3 and the form F is recast as the canonical trace element

$$\sum_{i_1+i_2+i_3=3} u_1^{i_1} u_2^{i_2} u_3^{i_3} \otimes x_1^{i_1} x_2^{i_2} x_3^{i_3} \in S_3 \otimes S_3^*.$$

The ring $\mathbf{C}[a_0, \dots, a_9]$ is identified with the symmetric algebra $R = \bigoplus_{\ell \geq 0} S_\ell(S_3)$, and we declare $\mathbb{P}S_3^* = \text{Proj } R$ to be the ambient space for all loci under consideration.

1.1. A Basis for $S_{m+n, n}$. There is a canonical injection (see [p.233 ff, loc.cit.])

$$S_{m+n, n} \longrightarrow \text{Sym}^n(\wedge^2 V) \otimes \text{Sym}^m(V),$$

and the right hand side has a basis of monomials

$$\{x_1^{n_1} x_2^{n_2} x_3^{n_3} \otimes u_1^{m_1} u_2^{m_2} u_3^{m_3} : \sum n_i = n, \sum m_i = m\}. \quad (1.3)$$

Let T be a semistandard tableau on numbers $1, 2, 3$ on the Young diagram of $(m+n, n)$. Say the entries in the first (resp. second) row are $r_1 \leq \dots \leq r_n \leq s_1 \leq \dots \leq s_m$ (resp. $t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_n$), with $r_i < t_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Let $x_{\langle r_i, t_i \rangle}$ denote resp. $x_1, -x_2, x_3$ if $(r_i, t_i) = (2, 3), (1, 3), (1, 2)$, and write

$$X_T = \prod_{i=1}^n x_{\langle r_i, t_i \rangle} \otimes \prod_{i=1}^m u_{s_i} \quad (1.4)$$

(E.g., for the tableau $T = [1 \ 2 \ 2 \ 2 \ 3 | 2 \ 3 \ 3]$ on $(5, 3)$, $X_T = x_1^2 x_3 \otimes u_2 u_3$.) Now (ignoring signs) the subset $\{X_T : T \text{ semistandard}\}$ of (1.3) is a basis for $S_{m+n, n}$.

²The ‘Symmetrica’ package and John Stembridge’s ‘SF’ package do this too, but I have found that ad-hoc routines for $\dim V = 3$ tend to work faster. Of course the issue of speed is more serious for the plethysm.

1.2. Concomitants. Let us assume that we have an injective map of representations

$$S_{m+n,n} \xrightarrow{\varphi} S_\ell(S_3),$$

or equivalently, an imbedding

$$\mathbf{C} \longrightarrow S_\ell(S_3) \otimes S_{m+n,n}^* (= S_\ell(S_3) \otimes S_{m+n,m}).$$

Let Φ denote the image of 1, which is a $\mathbf{Q}$ -linear combination of monomials

$$\left\{ \prod_{i=0}^9 a_i^{l_i} \otimes \prod_{i=1}^3 x_i^{m_i} \otimes \prod_{i=1}^3 u_i^{n_i} : \sum l_i = \ell, \sum m_i = m, \sum n_i = n \right\}.$$

In 19th century terminology (due to Sylvester), Φ is called a concomitant of degree ℓ , order m and class n (for ternary cubics). We indicate this by writing $\Phi_{\ell,m,n}$. Of course, there may exist more than one concomitant for given (ℓ, m, n) (or none at all). A concomitant is called a covariant (resp. contravariant) if its class (resp. order) is zero, and an invariant if both are zero. Note that the imbedding φ can be recovered from Φ .

For instance, the Hessian of a ternary cubic is a covariant of degree 3 and order 3. The dual of the curve $F = 0$ is defined by a contravariant of degree 4 and class 6.

1.3. The Symbolic Method. We will represent concomitants using the German symbolic method. A brief explanation follows, but it is unlikely to be intelligible without prior acquaintance with the method. The notation follows Grace and Young [10], also see [16, Ch. 6] for a modern exposition.

We will use the letters $x_1, x_2, x_3; u_1, u_2, u_3$. In addition, we have an indefinite supply of indexed Greek letters $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3; \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$ etc. Set

$$\alpha_x = \alpha_1 x_1 + \alpha_2 x_2 + \alpha_3 x_3 \quad \text{and ditto for } \beta_x, \gamma_x \text{ etc.}$$

Formally write $F = \alpha_x^3 = \beta_x^3 = \dots$. That is to say, after expansion, $\frac{3!}{i_1! i_2! i_3!} \alpha_1^{i_1} \alpha_2^{i_2} \alpha_3^{i_3}$ stands for the appropriate coefficient a_r in (0.1). The symbols $(\alpha \beta \gamma)$, $(\alpha \beta u)$ respectively stand for the determinants

$$\begin{vmatrix} \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \alpha_3 \\ \beta_1 & \beta_2 & \beta_3 \\ \gamma_1 & \gamma_2 & \gamma_3 \end{vmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{vmatrix} \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \alpha_3 \\ \beta_1 & \beta_2 & \beta_3 \\ u_1 & u_2 & u_3 \end{vmatrix}.$$

Now for instance, the Hessian is written $(\alpha\beta\gamma)^2\alpha_x\beta_x\gamma_x$. To evaluate this, multiply out the expression formally, and substitute the a_r 's as above. The result, appropriately, is a polynomial of degree 3 each in the $\underline{a}, \underline{x}$. As another example, the dual curve mentioned above has equation $(\alpha\beta u)^2(\gamma\delta u)^2(\alpha\gamma u)(\beta\delta u) = 0$.

Each concomitant $\Phi_{\ell,m,n}$ has a (non-unique) expression as a sum of products of symbols of the form $\alpha_x, (\alpha\beta\gamma), (\alpha\beta u)$. In *each* summand, the letters x, u should occur resp. m, n times, along with ℓ Greek letters, each occurring exactly thrice. Conversely, every such symbolic expression corresponds to a concomitant, unless it vanishes identically after substitution.

1.4. A Spectral Sequence. Let X be any of the loci above. The equivariant minimal resolution of its defining ideal $I_X < R$, will be written

$$\dots \rightarrow F^p \rightarrow F^{p+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow F^0 \rightarrow I_X \rightarrow 0,$$

$$\text{with } F^p = \bigoplus_{j>0} M_{j,-p} \otimes R(-j+p) \quad \text{for } p \leq 0. \quad (1.5)$$

Letting $\mathcal{F}^p = (F^p)^\sim = \bigoplus M_{j,-p} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^9}(-j+p)$, we have a resolution $\mathcal{F}^\bullet \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_X \rightarrow 0$, for the ideal sheaf. For $\ell \in \mathbf{Z}$, let $\mathcal{F}^p(\ell) = \mathcal{F}^p \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\ell)$. Then we have a second quadrant spectral sequence

$$\begin{aligned} \check{E}_1^{p,q} &= H^q(\mathbb{P}^9, \mathcal{F}^p(\ell)) \quad \text{for } p \leq 0, q \geq 0, \\ d_r : \check{E}_r^{p,q} &\rightarrow \check{E}_r^{p+r, q-r+1}; \quad \check{E}_\infty^{p,q} \Rightarrow H^{p+q}(\mathbb{P}^9, \mathcal{I}_X(\ell)). \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

This will be used in conjunction with the standard calculation of cohomology of line bundles on projective space ([13, Ch. III, Theorem 5.1]) and Serre duality.

The bulk of the paper is concerned with the identification of the $M_{j,-p}$ *qua* SL_3 -representations. The ideals and their Betti numbers (i.e. dimensions of $M_{j,-p}$) were calculated in Macaulay-2.

1.5. Computation of I_X . For illustration, consider the locus $X_\neq$. It is the image of the projective morphism

$$\mathbb{P}V^* \times \mathbb{P}V^* \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}S_3^*, \quad (L_1, L_2) \rightarrow L_1^2 L_2.$$

Let $L_1 = b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + b_3x_3$, $L_2 = c_1x_1 + c_2x_2 + c_3x_3$, where the b_i, c_i are indeterminates. By forcing the equality $F = L_1^2 L_2$, we get

polynomial expressions

$$a_r = \varphi_r(b_1, b_2, b_3; c_1, c_2, c_3) \quad \text{for } r = 0, \dots, 9;$$

defining a ring map $f_{\neq} : \mathbf{C}[a_0, \dots, a_9] \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}[b_1, \dots, c_3]$. Then $I_{X_{\neq}}$ equals $\ker(f_{\neq})$. Its minimal resolution is tabulated as follows:

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
3	20	45	36	10			
4	28	126	225	200	90	18	1

In the notation of (1.5), the entry in row j and column $-p$ is $\dim M_{j,-p}$. E.g., $M_{3,2}$ is 36-dimensional.

The loci $X_{\equiv}, X_{\Delta}, X_{\emptyset}$ are images of projective morphisms, respectively from $\mathbb{P}V^*, (\mathbb{P}V^*)^3, \mathbb{P}S_2^* \times \mathbb{P}V^*$ to $\mathbb{P}S_3^*$; hence a similar procedure works for them. That these loci are closed, follows from the fundamental theorem of elimination theory.

In order to find $I_{X_{\circ}}$, we need the tact-invariant of a conic and a line (see [19, §96]). Let

$$Q = q_1x_1^2 + q_2x_2^2 + q_3x_1x_2 + q_4x_1 + q_5x_2 + q_6, \quad L = b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + b_3.$$

Writing $Q.L = F|_{(x_3=1)}$, we get expressions $a_r = \varphi_r(q_1, \dots, b_3)$ as before. Let $\text{Res} = \text{Resultant}(Q, L; x_2)$, then the x_1 -values for which $\text{Res} = 0$ are the x_1 -coordinates of the points $Q = L = 0$. The condition that they coincide is $T' = \text{Discriminant}(\text{Res}, x_1) = 0$. Then the tact-invariant $T = \frac{1}{b_2^2}T'$. It vanishes iff the line $L = 0$ is tangent to $Q = 0$. (The extraneous factor appears because when $b_2 = 0$, the x_1 -coordinates coincide for any position of Q .) For what it is worth,

$$\begin{aligned} T = & 4q_2q_6b_1^2 - 4q_2q_4b_1b_3 + 4q_1q_2b_3^2 - q_5^2b_1^2 - 4q_3q_6b_1b_2 + 2q_4q_5b_1b_2 + \\ & 2q_3q_5b_1b_3 - q_4^2b_2^2 - 4q_1q_5b_2b_3 + 2q_3q_4b_2b_3 - q_3^2b_3^2 + 4q_1q_6b_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now $I_{X_{\circ}}$ is the kernel of the map

$$f_{\circ} : \mathbf{C}[a_0, \dots, a_9] \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}[q_1, \dots, b_3]/(T).$$

To calculate I_{X_Y} , let

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &= b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + b_3x_3 \\ L_2 &= c_1x_1 + c_2x_2 + c_3x_3 \\ L_3 &= d_1x_1 + d_2x_2 + d_3x_3 \end{aligned} \quad \text{and} \quad D = \begin{vmatrix} b_1 & b_2 & b_3 \\ c_1 & c_2 & c_3 \\ d_1 & d_2 & d_3 \end{vmatrix}.$$

Then $D = 0$ is the condition that the lines be concurrent. The φ_r are given by $F = L_1L_2L_3$, and I_{X_Y} is the kernel of

$$f_Y : \mathbf{C}[a_0, \dots, a_9] \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}[b_1, \dots, d_3]/(D).$$

1.6. Characters. We write the formal character of $S_{a,b}$ as $[S_{a,b}] = \sigma_{a,b}$. Every finite dimensional SL_3 -module U is uniquely expressible as a direct sum $\bigoplus (S_{a_i,b_i})^{\oplus n_i}$, hence write $[U] = \sum n_i \sigma_{a_i,b_i}$.

If $C^\bullet = \{C^p\}_p$ is a bounded complex of finite dimensional SL_3 -representations and SL -equivariant differentials, then define $[C^\bullet] = \sum_p (-1)^p [C^p]$. By Schur's lemma, we have

$$[C^\bullet] = \sum_p (-1)^p [H^p(C^\bullet)]. \quad (1.7)$$

2. THE LOCUS $X_\equiv$

The Betti numbers of I_X are

$$\begin{array}{c|cccccc} & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ \hline 2 & 27 & 105 & 189 & 189 & 105 & 27 & \\ 3 & & & & & & & 1 \end{array} \quad (2.1)$$

Now X is the cubic Veronese imbedding of $\mathbb{P}^2$, hence arithmetically Cohen–Macaulay. Since $\omega_X = \mathcal{O}_X(-1)$, it is moreover subcanonical, hence arithmetically Gorenstein. Thus the minimal resolution of R/I_X is centrally symmetric, i.e., M_{23}, M_{24}, M_{25}^3 are respectively dual to M_{22}, M_{21}, M_{20} .

Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{I}_X(\ell)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathbb{P}^9, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\ell)) & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\ell)) & \\ & & & \parallel & & \parallel & \\ & & & S_\ell(S_3) & \longrightarrow & S_{3\ell} & \end{array}$$

The map γ is surjective for $\ell \geq 0$, hence by (1.7),

$$[H^0(\mathcal{I}_X(\ell))] = [H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\ell))] - [H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(\ell))]. \quad (2.2)$$

Substitute $\ell = 2, 3$, and decompose the plethysms involved, then

$$[H^0(\mathcal{I}_X(2))] = \sigma_{42}, \quad [H^0(\mathcal{I}_X(3))] = \sigma_{72} + \sigma_{63} + \sigma_{33} + \sigma_{30}.^4$$

Now successively let $\ell = 2, 3$ in the spectral sequence (1.6). In each case, all nonzero terms are in the row $q = 0$, so $\check{E}_2 = \check{E}_\infty$. Thus we have $M_{20} = H^0(\mathcal{I}_X(2))$ and an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M_{21} \longrightarrow M_{20} \otimes S_3 \longrightarrow H^0(\mathcal{I}_X(3)) \longrightarrow 0.$$

³ Henceforth the commas are left out.

⁴ ... and even here.

It follows that $M_{20} = S_{42}$ and $M_{21} = S_{54} \oplus S_{51} \oplus S_{42} \oplus S_{21}$; hereafter written $M_{21} = \{54, 51, 42, 21\}$. Now M_{22} is calculated similarly using $\ell = 4$. This is the end result:

$$M_{20} = \{42\}, M_{21} = \{54, 51, 42, 21\}, M_{22} = \{63, 54, 51, 42, 33, 30, 21\}, \quad (2.3)$$

and since these are all self-dual, $M_{25} = M_{20}$, $M_{24} = M_{21}$, $M_{23} = M_{22}$ and of course $M_{36} = \{00\}$.

Problem 2.1. All the syzygy modules in the resolution are self-dual. One would like to know if this has any geometric significance and to what extent this is true of other Veronese imbeddings. (This is trivially true of the rational normal curve, since all SL_2 -representations are self-dual. But it fails for the quadratic imbedding of $\mathbb{P}^2$ in $\mathbb{P}^5$.)

As far as I know, the problem of describing an equivariant minimal resolution for the Veronese variety is open in general. See [11] for some results.

3. THE LOCUS $X_{\neq}$

The Betti numbers of I_X are

$$\begin{array}{c|cccccc} & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ \hline 3 & 20 & 45 & 36 & 10 & & & \\ 4 & 28 & 126 & 225 & 200 & 90 & 18 & 1 \end{array} \quad (3.1)$$

We have an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_{X_{\neq}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^9} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X_{\neq}} \longrightarrow 0, \quad (3.2)$$

and to use the spectral sequence (1.6), some knowledge of the groups $H^\bullet(\mathbb{P}^9, \mathcal{I}_X(\ell))$ is needed. We proceed in several steps.

3.1. Step I. Consider the commutative triangle

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{P}V^* & & \\ \delta \downarrow & \searrow g & \\ \mathbb{P}V^* \times \mathbb{P}V^* & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathbb{P}S_3^* \end{array}$$

where $f : (L_1, L_2) \rightarrow L_1^2 L_2$, and δ is the diagonal imbedding. Then image $f = X_{\neq}$, image $g = X_{\equiv}$. Define an $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^9}$ -module $\mathcal{Q}$ as the cokernel

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X_{\neq}} \longrightarrow f_* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q} \longrightarrow 0, \quad (3.3)$$

then $\text{supp}(\mathcal{Q}) = X_{\equiv}$.

Lemma 3.1. *There is an isomorphism $g^*\mathcal{Q} = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}^1$.*

PROOF. Let $\mathcal{J}$ be the ideal sheaf of $\text{image}(\delta)$, thus

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{J} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2} \longrightarrow \delta_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2} \longrightarrow 0.$$

We have a commutative ladder

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \ker 1 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{X_{\neq}} & \xrightarrow{1} & \mathcal{O}_{X_{\equiv}} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow 2 & & \downarrow 3 & & \downarrow 4 \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & f_*(\mathcal{J}) & \longrightarrow & f_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2} & \longrightarrow & g_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

(Since f is a finite morphism, f_* is exact.) Since 4 is an isomorphism, $\text{coker } 2 = \text{coker } 3$, giving a surjection $f_*(\mathcal{J}) \xrightarrow{q} \mathcal{Q}$. By ([13, p.110]), we have an adjoint morphism $\mathcal{J} \xrightarrow{q'} f^*\mathcal{Q}$. Now the composite

$$f^*f_*(\mathcal{J}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{J} \xrightarrow{q'} f^*\mathcal{Q}$$

is surjective, since f^* is right-exact. Hence q' must be surjective. Applying δ^* , we get a surjection $\delta^*(\mathcal{J}) \xrightarrow{q''} g^*\mathcal{Q}$. By definition, $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}^1$ equals $\delta^*(\mathcal{J})$.

To show that q'' is an isomorphism, it suffices to observe that both sheaves have the same Hilbert polynomial. By the Künneth formula,

$$H^0(f_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^9}(\ell)) = H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(2\ell)) \otimes H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\ell)),$$

and this combined with (3.1),(3.3) gives $9\ell^2 - 1$ as the Hilbert polynomial of $\mathcal{Q}$. As $g^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^9}(\ell) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(3\ell)$, that of $g^*\mathcal{Q}$ is $\ell^2 - 1$. That this is also the Hilbert polynomial of $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}^1$, can be seen from the Euler sequence. The lemma is proved. $\square$

3.2. Step II. The next step is to construct a complex of SL_3 -modules with *explicitly computable terms*, such that the global sections of $\mathcal{I}_X(\ell)$ and $\mathcal{Q}(\ell)$ appear as its cohomology modules. We will use the Borel–Weil–Bott theorem several times (see e.g. [5, Theorem 0.1]).

Let Y be the variety $\mathbb{P}V^* \times \mathbb{P}V^* \times \mathbb{P}S_3^*$ with projections μ_1, μ_2, π onto the successive factors. Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{P}V^* \times \mathbb{P}V^* & \xrightarrow{i} & Y \\ & \searrow f & \downarrow \pi \\ & & \mathbb{P}S_3^* \end{array} \quad (L_1, L_2) \xrightarrow{i} (L_1, L_2, L_1^2 L_2)$$

and let $\Gamma \subseteq Y$ be the image of i . Then $\pi(\Gamma) = X_{\neq}$ (henceforth written X). We will derive a Koszul resolution of $\mathcal{O}_\Gamma$. Define a vector bundle

$$\mathcal{A} = \mu_1^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2) \otimes \mu_2^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(1) \otimes \pi^* T_{\mathbb{P}^9}(-1)$$

on Y . If $y = (L_1, L_2, F)$ be a point of Y , then the fibre of $\mathcal{A}$ over y is the 9-dimensional vector space

$$\langle L_1^2 \rangle^* \otimes \langle L_2 \rangle^* \otimes S_3^* / \langle F \rangle.$$

Here $\langle L_1^2 \rangle \subseteq S_2^*$ is the one dimensional space generated by L_1^2 , etc.

By the Künneth formula, $H^0(Y, \mathcal{A}) = S_2 \otimes S_1 \otimes S_3^*$. The multiplication map $S_2^* \otimes S_1^* \rightarrow S_3^*$ corresponds to a distinguished section ξ in $H^0(Y, \mathcal{A})$.

Lemma 3.2. *The zero scheme of ξ is Γ .*

PROOF. To say that ξ vanishes at y , is to say that the element $L_1^2 L_2 + \langle F \rangle \in S_3^* / \langle F \rangle$ is zero. This happens iff $y \in \Gamma$. $\square$

Now $\text{codim}(\Gamma, Y) = \text{rank } \mathcal{A} = 9$, hence the Koszul complex of ξ resolves Γ .

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow \wedge^9 \mathcal{A}^* \rightarrow \dots \wedge^{-p} \mathcal{A}^* \xrightarrow{\wedge \xi} \wedge^{-(p+1)} \mathcal{A}^* \rightarrow \dots \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\Gamma \rightarrow 0, \\ \text{for } -9 \leq p \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Consider the hypercohomology spectral sequence

$$\begin{aligned} E_1^{p,q} &= \mathbf{R}^q \pi_* (\wedge^{-p} \mathcal{A}^*), & d_r : E_r^{p,q} &\longrightarrow E_r^{p+r, q-r+1}; \\ E_\infty^{p+q} &\Rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{p+q} \pi_* (\mathcal{O}_\Gamma) & \text{for } -9 \leq p \leq 0, q \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Now

$$\wedge^{-p} \mathcal{A}^* = \mu_1^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2p) \otimes \mu_2^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(p) \otimes \pi^* \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^9}^{-p}(-p);$$

hence

$$\mathbf{R}^q \pi_* (\wedge^{-p} \mathcal{A}^*) = \left\{ \bigoplus_{i+j=q} H^i(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2p)) \otimes H^j(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(p)) \right\} \otimes \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^9}^{-p}(-p).$$

Apart from $E_1^{0,0} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^9}$, all nonzero terms are concentrated in the row $q = 4$ and columns $-9 \leq p \leq -3$. Using Serre duality,

$$\begin{aligned} E_1^{p,4} &= H^2(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2p)) \otimes H^2(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(p)) \otimes \Omega^{-p}(-p) \\ &= S_{-(2p+3)}^* \otimes S_{-(p+3)}^* \otimes \Omega^{-p}(-p). \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Define a complex $\mathcal{G}^\bullet$ by $\mathcal{G}^p = E_1^{p,4}$, with d_1 as the differential. It lives in the range $-9 \leq p \leq -3$.

Proposition 3.3. *The cohomology of $\mathcal{G}^\bullet$ equals*

$$\mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{G}^\bullet)(= E_2^{p,4}) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{I}_X & \text{if } p = -5, \\ \mathcal{Q} & \text{if } p = -4, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

PROOF. Clearly $E_2 = \cdots = E_5$ and $E_6 = E_\infty$. Since $\pi|_\Gamma$ is a finite morphism, $\mathbf{R}^{\geq 1}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_\Gamma = 0$. Hence for $p \neq -5, -4$, we have $E_2^{p,4} = E_\infty^{p,4} = 0$. Consider the extension

$$0 \rightarrow E_6^{0,0} \rightarrow \pi_*\mathcal{O}_\Gamma \rightarrow E_6^{-4,4} \rightarrow 0.$$

The term $E_6^{0,0}$ is the image of the natural map $E_1^{0,0}(= \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^9}) \rightarrow \pi_*\mathcal{O}_\Gamma$, which is $\mathcal{O}_X$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} E_5^{-5,4} &= \ker(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^9} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X) = \mathcal{I}_X, \\ E_5^{-4,4} &= \operatorname{coker}(\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \pi_*\mathcal{O}_\Gamma) = \mathcal{Q}. \end{aligned}$$

□

For $\ell \in \mathbf{Z}$, write $\mathcal{G}^\bullet(\ell) = \mathcal{G}^\bullet \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^9}(\ell)$. All further calculation revolves around the hypercohomology of $\mathcal{G}^\bullet(\ell)$. There are two second quadrant spectral sequences

$$E_1^{p,q} = H^q(\mathbb{P}^9, \mathcal{G}^p(\ell)), \quad d_r : E_r^{p,q} \longrightarrow E_r^{p+r, q-r+1}; \quad (3.7)$$

$$'E_2^{p,q} = H^q(\mathbb{P}^9, \mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{G}^\bullet(\ell))), \quad 'd_r : 'E_r^{p,q} \longrightarrow 'E_r^{p-r+1, q+r}; \quad (3.8)$$

with $E_\infty^{p,q}, 'E_\infty^{p,q} \Rightarrow \mathbb{H}^{p+q}(\mathcal{G}^\bullet(\ell))$. If ℓ is clear from the context, we write $\mathbb{H}^j$ for $\mathbb{H}^j(\mathcal{G}^\bullet(\ell))$. Henceforth a symbol such as $E_r^{p,q}$ refers to (3.7), and *not* to (3.5).

3.3. Step III: Analysis of (3.7). The terms

$$E_1^{p,q} = S_{-(2p+3)}^* \otimes S_{-(p+3)}^* \otimes H^q(\mathbb{P}^9, \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^9}^{-p}(\ell - p)) \quad (3.9)$$

and $'E_2^{-4,q} = H^q(\mathbb{P}^9, \mathcal{Q}(\ell))$ are evaluated by appealing to the Borel–Weil–Bott theorem. The result is as follows:

1. Assume $\ell > 0$, and let $\lambda = (\ell, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{-p \text{ times}})$. Then

$$H^q(\Omega^{-p}(\ell - p)) = \begin{cases} S_\lambda(S_3) & \text{for } q = 0, \\ 0 & \text{for } q \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

Moreover $H^q(\mathcal{Q}(\ell))$ is $S_{3\ell-1,1}$ for $q = 0$ and 0 if $q \neq 0$.

2. Assume $-9 \leq \ell \leq -1$. Then

$$H^q(\Omega^{-p}(\ell - p)) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & \text{for } (p, q) = (\ell, -\ell), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover $H^q(\mathcal{Q}(\ell))$ is $S_{-(3\ell+1), -(3\ell+2)}$ if $q = 2$ and 0 if $q \neq 2$.

Other values of ℓ are not difficult to analyse, but we will not need them. One can now decompose (3.9) into irreducible pieces using plethysms and the Littlewood-Richardson rule.

3.4. Step IV: Analysis of (3.8) and $\mathbb{H}^\bullet$. The term $'E_2^{p,q}$ can be nonzero only for $p = -5, -4$, so $'E_3 = 'E_\infty$. By its construction, the differential $'d_2$ is a composite of two connecting maps

$$H^q(\mathcal{Q}(\ell)) \xrightarrow{\alpha_q} H^{q+1}(\mathcal{O}_X(\ell)) \xrightarrow{\beta_q} H^{q+2}(\mathcal{I}_X(\ell))$$

coming from sequences (3.2), (3.3).

1. Assume $\ell \geq 0$, then the groups

$$H^{\geq 1}(f_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^9}(\ell)), \quad H^{\geq 1}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^9}(\ell))$$

vanish. Hence α_q is surjective for $q = 0$ and an isomorphism for $q \geq 1$, whereas β_q is always an isomorphism. Hence $'E_3^{p,q} = 0$ unless $(p, q) = (-5, 0), (-5, 1)$ or $(-4, 0)$. Then

$$\mathbb{H}^{-5} = 'E_3^{-5,0} = 'E_2^{-5,0} = H^0(\mathcal{I}_X(\ell)), \quad (3.10)$$

and there is an extension

$$0 \rightarrow 'E_3^{-5,1} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^{-4} \rightarrow 'E_3^{-4,0} \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.11)$$

In fact $'E_3^{-5,1} = 'E_2^{-5,1} = H^1(\mathcal{I}_X(\ell))$ and $'E_3^{-4,0}$ is the kernel of the map $H^0(\mathcal{Q}(\ell)) \rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{I}_X(\ell))$.

The terms $E_1^{p,q}$ are nonzero only for $q = 0$, so $E_2 = E_\infty$ and $\mathbb{H}^{-5} = E_2^{-5,0}$, $\mathbb{H}^{-4} = E_2^{-4,0}$.

2. Now assume $-9 \leq \ell \leq -1$, then the maps α_q, β_q are bijective for $0 \leq q \leq 2$. The only nonzero $'E_2^{-4,q}$ term is at $q = 2$, hence

$$H^4(\mathcal{I}_X(\ell)) = H^2(\mathcal{Q}(\ell)) = S_{-(3\ell+1), -(3\ell+2)}. \quad (3.12)$$

If $\ell = -2, -1$, then each $E_1^{p,q}$ term is zero, hence $\mathbb{H}^\bullet$ is identically zero. If $\ell \leq -3$, then $E_1^{p,q}$ is nonzero exactly when $(p, q) = (\ell, -\ell)$. In that case, we have

$$\mathbb{H}^0 = S_{-(2\ell+3)}^* \otimes S_{-(\ell+3)}^*, \quad \mathbb{H}^j = 0 \quad \text{if } j \neq 0. \quad (3.13)$$

The preparations are over, and the computation proper may begin.

3.5. Step V. The procedure is to use formula (1.7) on complexes $\{\check{E}_1^{p,q}\}_p$ and $\{E_1^{p,q}\}_p$ coming from the rows of (1.6) and (3.7). As explained earlier, if $\ell > 0$, then $[E_1^{\bullet,0}]$ can be calculated explicitly using plethysms followed by the L-R rule.

Since M_{30} is a 20-dimensional summand of $S_3(S_3)$, it is necessarily $\{33, 30\}$. Let $\ell = 4$, then

$$[\mathbb{H}^{-4}] - [\mathbb{H}^{-5}] = [E_1^{\bullet,0}] = \sigma_{11,1} - (\sigma_{66} + \sigma_{63} + \sigma_{60} + \sigma_{51} + \sigma_{42} + \sigma_{00}). \quad (3.14)$$

(This is a heavy Maple computation.) The only nonzero terms in (1.6) are $\check{E}_1^{0,0}$ and $\check{E}_1^{-1,0}$. Hence $H^j(\mathcal{I}_X(4)) = 0$ for $j \neq 0$ and

$$[H^0(\mathcal{I}_X(4))] = [M_{40} \oplus (M_{30} \otimes S_3)] - [M_{31}]. \quad (3.15)$$

From (3.10) and (3.11),

$$[\mathbb{H}^{-5}] = [H^0(\mathcal{I}_X(4))], \quad [\mathbb{H}^{-4}] = [H^0(\mathcal{Q}(4))] = \sigma_{11,1}. \quad (3.16)$$

From $[M_{30}] = \sigma_{33} + \sigma_{30}$, the value of $[M_{30} \otimes S_3]$ is known by the L-R rule. From (3.14)–(3.16), we have

$$[M_{40}] - [M_{31}] = \sigma_{66} - (\sigma_{42} + \sigma_{33} + \sigma_{21}).$$

Since $\dim M_{40} = 28$, this forces $M_{40} = \{66\}$ and $M_{31} = \{42, 33, 21\}$.

Now let $\ell = 5$. Then (by an even heavier computation)

$$[\mathbb{H}^{-4}] - [\mathbb{H}^{-5}] = [E_1^{\bullet,0}] = \sigma_{14,1} - (\sigma_{96} + \sigma_{93} + \sigma_{90} + \sigma_{81} + \sigma_{75} + 2\sigma_{72} + \sigma_{63} + \sigma_{54} + \sigma_{51} + \sigma_{33} + \sigma_{30}). \quad (3.17)$$

From (1.6), we deduce that $\mathcal{I}_X(5)$ has no higher cohomology and

$$[H^0(\mathcal{I}_X(5))] = [\check{E}_1^{0,0}] - [\check{E}_1^{-1,0}] + [\check{E}_1^{-2,0}] = [M_{30} \otimes S_2(S_3)] + [M_{40} \otimes S_3] - [M_{31} \otimes S_3] - [M_{41}] + [M_{32}]. \quad (3.18)$$

As before

$$[\mathbb{H}^{-5}] = [H^0(\mathcal{I}_X(5))], \quad [\mathbb{H}^{-4}] = [H^0(\mathcal{Q}(5))] = \sigma_{14,1}. \quad (3.19)$$

Combining (3.17)–(3.19), we have a relation

$$[M_{32}] + (\sigma_{75} + \sigma_{54} + \sigma_{33}) = [M_{41}] + (\sigma_{42} + \sigma_{21} + \sigma_{00}),$$

which implies $M_{32} = \{42, 21, 00\}$ and $M_{41} = \{75, 54, 33\}$. Evidently we could continue the procedure with larger and larger ℓ , and calculate all the $M_{j,-p}$. Alternately, we can twist by a negative ℓ and work our way from the other end of the resolution.

For instance, let $\ell = -1$. The only nontrivial map in (1.6) is

$$\check{E}_1^{-6,9} \longrightarrow \check{E}_1^{-5,9}, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad M_{46} \otimes S_3^* \longrightarrow M_{45}.$$

It has kernel $H^3(\mathcal{I}_X(-1)) = H^1(\mathcal{Q}(-1)) = 0$, and cokernel $H^4(\mathcal{I}_X(-1)) = H^2(\mathcal{Q}(-1)) = S_{21}$. Hence

$$\sigma_{21} = [M_{45}] - [M_{46} \otimes S_3^*].$$

Substituting $M_{46} = \{00\}$, we have $M_{45} = \{33, 21\}$. Now let $\ell = -2$ to calculate M_{44} , etc. These are the fruits of our labour:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{30} &= \{33, 30\}, & M_{31} &= \{42, 33, 21\}, \\ M_{32} &= \{42, 21, 00\}, & M_{33} &= \{30\}, \\ M_{40} &= \{66\}, & M_{41} &= \{75, 54, 33\}, \\ M_{42} &= \{75, 63, 54, 42, 33, 21\}, & M_{43} &= \{66, 63, 54, 42, 42, 30, 21, 00\}, \\ M_{44} &= \{54, 42, 33, 30, 21\}, & M_{45} &= \{33, 21\}, \\ M_{46} &= \{00\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Scholium 3.4. *In principle*, we can work with negative ℓ throughout and bypass steps II–IV altogether. I see two reasons dictating against this. Firstly, the procedure becomes impractical as we move rightwards in the resolution. (For instance, in order to reach M_{40} , we need to set $\ell = -6$ and then calculate $M_{45} \otimes S_5(S_3^*)$ amongst other things.) Secondly, (and what is more to the point) I believe that the construction used here is of interest not confined to this example. In [4], it was used on varieties defined by binary forms having roots of specified multiplicities.

4. THE LOCUS X_Δ

$$\begin{array}{c|cccccccc} & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\ \hline 4 & 35 & 119 & 210 & 252 & 210 & 120 & 45 & 10 & 1 \\ 5 & & & 1 & & & & & & \end{array} \tag{4.1}$$

The symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_3$ acts on $(\mathbb{P}V^*)^3$ by permuting the factors, and X_Δ is the categorical quotient $(\mathbb{P}V^*)^3/\mathfrak{S}_3$. Hence for $\ell \geq 0$, the group $H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(\ell))$ is the $\mathfrak{S}_3$ -invariant part of

$$(H^0(\mathbb{P}V^*, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\ell)))^{\otimes 3} = (S_\ell)^{\otimes 3},$$

which is $S_3(S_\ell)$. By the same argument, $H^j(\mathcal{O}_X(\ell)) = 0$ for $\ell \in \mathbf{Z}$, $0 < j < 6$; and $H^6(\mathcal{O}_X(\ell)) = S_3(S_{-(\ell+3)}^*)$ for $\ell \leq -3$. Now we have identifications

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{I}_X(\ell)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathbb{P}^9, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\ell)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\ell)) \\ & & & & \parallel & & \parallel \\ & & & & S_\ell(S_3) & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & S_3(S_\ell) \end{array}$$

If $\ell \geq 3$, then in (1.6) we have $\check{E}_1^{p,q} = 0$ for $q > 0$, so $H^1(\mathcal{I}_X(\ell)) = 0$. Thus γ is surjective for $\ell \geq 3$. (This is a rather special instance of Foulkes's conjecture—see e.g. [15, p.141].) Now formula (2.2) holds, and the calculation proceeds as in that case. This gets tedious for high values of ℓ , but one can bypass it by calculating from the other end of the resolution.

For example, let $\ell = 1$. The only nontrivial map in (1.6) is

$$\check{E}_1^{-8,9} \xrightarrow{d_1} \check{E}_1^{-7,9}, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad M_{48} \otimes H^9(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(-11)) \longrightarrow M_{47}.$$

Since $H^j(\mathbb{P}^9, \mathcal{I}_X(1)) = 0$ for $j = 1, 2$, this map is an isomorphism. Hence $M_{47} = \{33\}$. Now let $\ell = 0$ and calculate M_{46} , etc. The outcome is

$$\begin{aligned} M_{40} &= \{51\}, \quad M_{41} = \{63, 60, 42\}, \quad M_{42} = \{72, 66, 63, 42, 30\}, \\ M_{43} &= \{75, 72, 54, 51, 33, 30\}, \quad M_{44} = \{75, 63, 60, 42, 33\}, \\ M_{45} &= \{66, 63, 42, 00\}, \quad M_{46} = \{54, 30\}, \quad M_{47} = \{33\}, \\ M_{48} &= \{00\}, \quad M_{52} = \{00\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

In [19, §226], Salmon gives a system of forty-five equations each of degree 4 in the $\underline{a}$, which is satisfied iff the cubic F breaks up into three lines. Thus the system generates an ideal J such that $\sqrt{J} = I_X$. His construction is natural with respect to the SL_3 -action, hence $(J)_4 \subseteq M_{40}$ is a subrepresentation. Since M_{40} is irreducible, $J = I_X$. It follows that there are ten dependencies in his system, something which is not a priori evident.

- Problem 4.1.** 1. The resolution shows some measure of duality, viz., $M_{42} = M_{44}^*$, $M_{41} \oplus \mathbf{C} = M_{45}^*$, $M_{43} = M_{43}^*$. There ought to be a theoretical explanation.
2. It follows from simple degree considerations that M_{40} must be identical to the set of Brill's equations ([9, p.139 ff]). It would be worthwhile to check this by direct calculation.

The next two computations are less conceptual than the preceding ones, in that they rely upon incidental features of the resolution.

5. THE LOCUS $X_\emptyset$

$$\begin{array}{c|cccc}
 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
 \hline
 8 & 35 & 70 & 45 & 8 \\
 9 & & & & 1
 \end{array} \tag{5.1}$$

We decompose $S_8(S_3)$ and look for a 35-dimensional subrepresentation. The only possibilities for M_{80} are found to be $\{51\}$ or $\{54\}$. In fact, it turns out that $M_{80} = \{54\}$. Let us grant this for the moment and postpone the justification to §8.4.

Substitute $\ell = 9$ in (1.6). The only nontrivial map $\check{E}_1^{-1,0} \xrightarrow{d_1} \check{E}_1^{0,0}$, i.e., $M_{81} \rightarrow M_{80} \otimes S_3$, is necessarily injective. On dimensional grounds $M_{81} = \{54, 42, 21\}$. Now $H^6(\mathcal{O}_X) = 0$ (this was verified in Macaulay-2), hence $H^7(\mathcal{I}_X) = 0$. But from (1.6), this group is the cokernel of the map

$$(M_{83} \otimes S_3^*) \oplus S_2(S_3^*) \longrightarrow M_{82}.$$

Since $S_2(S_{33}) = \{66, 42\}$, it cannot by itself contribute a 45-dimensional summand. But then $M_{83} = \{21\}$ is forced. Now the only possibilities for M_{82} are $\{54, 33\}$, $\{42, 33, 21\}$. Since the resolution is minimal, the map $M_{93} \otimes R(-12) \longrightarrow M_{82} \otimes R(-10)$ is nonzero. Hence $M_{82} \otimes R_2 = M_{82} \otimes S_2(S_3)$ must contain a trivial summand. This rules out $\{54, 33\}$, so $M_{82} = \{42, 33, 21\}$. In sum,

$$\begin{aligned}
 M_{80} &= \{54\}, & M_{81} &= \{54, 42, 21\}, & M_{82} &= \{42, 33, 21\}, \\
 M_{83} &= \{21\}, & M_{93} &= \{00\}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

In [19, §240], Salmon gives a system of equations each of degree 8 in the $\underline{a}$, which is satisfied iff the cubic F is factorisable. Using an argument similar to the case X_Δ , it follows that his system generates $I_{X_\emptyset}$.

Problem 5.1. Define $\mathcal{Q} = \text{coker}(\mathcal{O}_{X_\emptyset} \rightarrow f_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}S_2^* \times \mathbb{P}V^*})$ as in the case of $X_\neq$. It would be of interest to calculate it explicitly along the lines of lemma 3.1, or even to calculate the groups $H^\bullet(\mathcal{Q}(\ell))$. Once this is done, there is no difficulty in adapting steps II–V to $X_\emptyset$.

6. THE LOCUS $X_{\mathbb{O}}$

$$\begin{array}{c|ccc}
& 0 & 1 & 2 \\
\hline
4 & 1 & & \\
5 & 10 & 8 & \\
6 & & 10 & 8
\end{array} \tag{6.1}$$

Now $M_{40} = \{00\}$ and $H^0(\mathcal{I}_X(5)) = (M_{40} \otimes S_3) \oplus M_{50}$ is a 20-dimensional module inside $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(5)) = S_5(S_3)$. Decomposing the latter, on dimensional grounds the module can only be $\{33, 30\}$. So $M_{50} = \{33\}$.

Now M_{51} is a summand of $(M_{40} \otimes R_2) \oplus (M_{50} \otimes R_1)$, so it must be $\{21\}$. Since M_{61} is a summand of $(M_{40} \otimes R_3) \oplus (M_{50} \otimes R_2)$, it is either $\{33\}$ or $\{30\}$, we do not yet know which. Decompose $(M_{61} \otimes R_1) \oplus (M_{51} \otimes R_2)$ for each of the possibilities, and one sees that M_{62} is necessarily $\{21\}$.

It remains to determine M_{61} . Since X is 6-dimensional, $H^8(\mathcal{I}_X(-3)) = 0$. Substituting $\ell = -3$ in (1.6), this group appears as the cokernel of

$$M_{62} \otimes H^9(\mathbb{P}^9, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(-11)) \longrightarrow M_{61}.$$

The only 10-dimensional summand of $\{21\} \otimes \{33\}$ is $\{33\}$, so $M_{61} = \{33\}$. Thus

$$M_{40} = \{00\}, M_{50} = \{33\}, M_{51} = \{21\}, M_{61} = \{33\}, M_{62} = \{21\}. \tag{6.2}$$

Problem 6.1. Without recourse to a machine computation, show that $X_{\mathbb{O}}$ is arithmetically Cohen–Macaulay. (This will probably involve the theory of complete conics.)

7. THE LOCUS X_Y

$$\begin{array}{c|cccc}
& 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
\hline
3 & 20 & 45 & 36 & 10
\end{array} \tag{7.1}$$

This is a rank variety in the sense of Porras [17], and its resolution is deduced there (Prop. 4.2.3). We summarise the solution.

A subspace W of V^* gives an inclusion $\mathbb{P}(S_3 W) \subseteq \mathbb{P}(S_3 V^*)$. Then

$$X_Y = \{F : F \in \mathbb{P}(S_3 W) \text{ for some proper subspace } W\}.$$

(This is so, because the L_i define concurrent lines iff they fail to span V^* .) The multiplication $S_2 \otimes S_1 \longrightarrow S_3$ gives a map of vector bundles

$$\alpha : \underbrace{S_2 \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(-1)}_{\mathcal{B}} \longrightarrow V^* \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}$$

on $\mathbb{P}S_3^*$. Then X coincides (as a scheme) with the degeneracy locus $\{\text{rank } \alpha \leq 2\}$, and the Eagon–Northcott complex of α resolves its structure sheaf.

$$0 \rightarrow \wedge^6 \mathcal{B} \otimes S_3 \rightarrow \wedge^5 \mathcal{B} \otimes S_2 \rightarrow \wedge^4 \mathcal{B} \otimes S_1 \rightarrow \wedge^3 \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^9} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X_Y} \rightarrow 0.$$

Now $\wedge^j \mathcal{B} = \wedge^j S_2 \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(-j)$, and after decomposing these further

$$M_{30} = \{33, 30\}, M_{31} = \{42, 33, 21\}, M_{32} = \{42, 21, 00\}, M_{33} = \{30\}. \quad (7.2)$$

8. IDEAL GENERATORS AND CONCOMITANTS

Let X be any of the loci above. For $\ell \geq 1$, we have an exact sequence

$$(I_X)_{\ell-1} \otimes S_3 \longrightarrow S_{\ell}(S_3) \xrightarrow{g_{\ell}} U_{\ell} \longrightarrow 0.$$

The module $M_{\ell,0}$ consists of degree ℓ primitive generators for I_X , as such it is a submodule of U_{ℓ} . Let $S_{m+n,n} \subseteq M_{\ell,0}$ be a direct summand. By choosing an equivariant splitting of g_{ℓ} , we may write $S_{m+n,n} \subseteq S_{\ell}(S_3)$. Then by §1.2, to specify this inclusion is to specify a concomitant $\Phi_{\ell,m,n}$.

It turns out that in *every* case under consideration, there is only one copy of $S_{m+n,n}$ inside $S_{\ell}(S_3)$, hence the inclusion is independent of the choice of the splitting.⁵ Thus it is enough to produce some symbolic expression of type (ℓ, m, n) (by trial and error), and to verify that it does not vanish identically after substitution. Then it must be the $\Phi_{\ell,m,n}$ that we are looking for. Besides doing this, in each case I have verified by direct computation (in Macaulay-2) that Φ vanishes on X . Although logically superfluous, this is a very useful check against the propagation of error.

⁵There is no difficulty in adapting to the case when this is not so.

8.1. **Case $X_{\equiv}$.** Corresponding to $M_{20} = \{42\}$, we need a concomitant of type $(2, 2, 2)$. The only legal symbolic expression is

$$\Phi_{222} = (\alpha \beta u)^2 \alpha_x \beta_x.$$

To recapitulate, let $T_1, \dots, T_{27}$ be the semistandard tableaux on $(4, 2)$ (see §1.1) and write $\Phi_{222} = \sum_{i=1}^{27} f_i \otimes X_{T_i}$. (A priori, after expansion Φ will contain nonstandard monomials such as $x_1^2 u_1 u_3$. These can be rewritten as linear combinations of the X_T using the straightening law—see [7, §8.1].) Then $I_X = (f_1, \dots, f_{27})$. This can be rephrased as a criterion:

A ternary cubic F can be written as the cube of a linear form iff the concomitant $(\alpha \beta u)^2 \alpha_x \beta_x$ vanishes on F . There is a similar claim for each X .

8.2. **Case $X_{\neq}$.**

$$M_{30} \mapsto \Phi_{303} = (\alpha \beta \gamma)(\alpha \beta u)(\alpha \gamma u)(\beta \gamma u), \quad \Phi_{330} = (\alpha \beta \gamma)^2 \alpha_x \beta_x \gamma_x.$$

These are respectively the Cayleyan and the Hessian of F (see [19, §218, 219]).

$$M_{40} \mapsto \Phi_{406} = (\alpha \beta u)^2 (\gamma \delta u)^2 (\alpha \delta u)(\beta \gamma u).$$

8.3. **Case X_{Δ} .**

$$M_{40} \mapsto \Phi_{441} = (\alpha \beta \gamma)(\alpha \gamma \delta)(\alpha \beta u) \beta_x \gamma_x \delta_x^2.$$

8.4. **Case $X_{\emptyset}$.** We are yet to prove that M_{80} is $\{54\}$ and not $\{51\}$. There is a well known invariant of ternary cubics in degree 4, namely the Aronhold invariant (see [20, p. 167])

$$\Phi_{400} = (\alpha \beta \gamma)(\alpha \beta \delta)(\alpha \gamma \delta)(\beta \gamma \delta).$$

Decomposing $S_8(S_3)$, one sees that it houses exactly one copy each of S_{51}, S_{54} . Hence there is one concomitant each of type $(8, 4, 1), (8, 1, 4)$. Now Φ_{841} is necessarily equal to the product $\Phi_{400}\Phi_{441}$. Since $I_{X_{\emptyset}}$ has no generators in degree 4, none of the factors can vanish on $X_{\emptyset}$. Hence $M_{80} \neq \{51\}$. Thus

$$M_{80} \mapsto \Phi_{814} = \alpha_x (\alpha \beta \gamma)(\alpha \beta \delta)(\beta \gamma \epsilon)(\gamma \zeta u)(\delta \epsilon u)(\delta \eta u)(\epsilon \theta u)(\zeta \eta \theta)^2.$$

It is quite easy to concoct symbolic expressions of type $(8, 1, 4)$, but most will vanish identically after expansion. It cost the author a week's labour to find one which does not.

8.5. Case $X_{\mathbb{O}}$.

$$M_{40} \longmapsto \Phi_{400} \text{ (as written above).}$$

$$M_{50} \longmapsto \Phi_{503} = (\alpha \beta \gamma) (\alpha \beta \delta) (\beta \gamma \epsilon) (\alpha \gamma u) (\delta \epsilon u)^2.$$

8.6. Case X_Y .

$$M_{30} \longmapsto \Phi_{303}, \Phi_{330} \text{ (as written above).}$$

In fact, the Hessian vanishes identically iff the Cayleyan does. (This is an easy deduction from the formulae in [3].) Hence either one defines the locus set-theoretically. Also see [16, p. 234] for a discussion of the Gordan–Nöther theorem.

Scholium 8.1. The symbolic method can be used for describing the higher syzygies as well. We will give an illustration of this idea but will not attempt any systematic treatment. Consider the resolution of $X_{\equiv}$, in particular the submodule $S_{54} \subseteq M_{21}$. Keep the notation of §8.1. We have the differential

$$S_{54} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(-3) \xrightarrow{\partial^1} S_{42} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(-2),$$

or equivalently, a map

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}} \longrightarrow S_{42} \otimes S_{51} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1),$$

or equivalently, an element

$$\Psi \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^9, S_{42} \otimes S_{51} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)) = S_{42} \otimes S_{51} \otimes S_3.$$

We would like to represent Ψ symbolically. Let $\underline{y} = \{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ be ‘copies’ of the variables $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$, and ditto for $\underline{v} = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ answering to $\{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$. Let $\mathbb{T}_1, \dots, \mathbb{T}_{35}$ be the semistandard tableaux on numbers 1, 2, 3 on the Young diagram of $(5, 1)$. Exactly as in §1.1, $Y_{\mathbb{T}_j}$ will denote a monomial in the $\underline{y}, \underline{v}$ corresponding to $\mathbb{T}_j$. Write $\alpha_y = \alpha_1 y_1 + \alpha_2 y_2 + \alpha_3 y_3$, $v_x = v_1 x_1 + v_2 x_2 + v_3 x_3$, and

$$(\alpha u v) = \begin{vmatrix} \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \alpha_3 \\ u_1 & u_2 & u_3 \\ v_1 & v_2 & v_3 \end{vmatrix}.$$

A calculation (which we suppress) shows that $\Psi = (\alpha u v)^2 \alpha_y v_x^2$. That is to say, after expanding the product and substituting, we can write

$$\Psi = \sum_{j=1}^{35} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{27} h_{ij} \otimes X_{T_i} \right) \otimes Y_{\mathbb{T}_j},$$

where h_{ij} are linear forms in the $\underline{a}$. Let Σ_j be the sum in the parentheses multiplying $Y_{\mathbb{T}_j}$. Then Σ_j represents a linear syzygy between the ideal generators f_i , namely $\sum_{i=1}^{27} h_{ij} f_i = 0$. This accounts for the 35 syzygies corresponding to the summand $S_{54} \subseteq M_{21}$, and of course other summands are given by other symbolic expressions. In fact

$$S_{51} \longmapsto \alpha_x \alpha_y^2 v_x u_y^2, \quad S_{42} \longmapsto (\alpha u v) \alpha_x \alpha_y v_x u_y, \quad S_{21} \longmapsto (\alpha u v) \alpha_x^2 u_y.$$

The complete system of concomitants for a ternary cubic is given by Cayley [3]. I enclose a table collating our notation with his.

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{222} &= \Theta \quad (\text{no.4}), & \Phi_{303} &= P \quad (\text{no.5}), & \Phi_{330} &= H \quad (\text{no.12}), \\ \Phi_{406} &= F \quad (\text{no.17}), & \Phi_{441} &= J \quad (\text{no.19}), & \Phi_{400} &= S \quad (\text{no.1}), \\ \Phi_{814} &= \bar{J} \quad (\text{no.27}), & \Phi_{503} &= Q \quad (\text{no.16}). \end{aligned}$$

Scholium 8.2. The invariant S is ubiquitous in the geometry of plane cubics, it is essentially the same as the Eisenstein series g_2 . There is a sextic invariant (also called T)

$$\Phi_{600} = (\alpha \beta \gamma)(\alpha \beta \delta)(\beta \gamma \epsilon)(\alpha \gamma \zeta)(\delta \epsilon \zeta)^2,$$

which is g_3 in a different guise. The discriminant Δ of F is a linear combination of S^3 and T^2 (the coefficients depend on one's normalisation). Now $\Delta = 0$ is the closure of the locus of nodal cubics. The locus of cuspidal cubics is the complete intersection $S = T = 0$. (See [19, §224].)

Several geometric theorems about the Cayleyan can be found in [2] (where it is called the Pippian). The invariant S vanishes on a smooth cubic curve iff the latter is projectively isomorphic to the Fermat cubic $x_1^3 + x_2^3 + x_3^3 = 0$. Such cubics are called anharmonic. See [6] for some beautiful results in this vein.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Carrell and J. Dieudonné. *Invariant theory, old and new*. Academic Press, New York–London, 1971.
- [2] A. Cayley. A memoir on curves of the third order. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, vol. cxlvii, pp. 415–446, 1856. Reprinted in Volume II of his *Collected Mathematical Papers* by Cambridge Univ. Press, 1889.

- [3] A. Cayley. On the 34 concomitants of the ternary cubic. *American J. of Math.*, vol. iv, pp. 1–15, 1881. Reprinted in Volume XI of his Collected Mathematical Papers by Cambridge Univ. Press, 1889.
- [4] J. Chipalkatti. On equations defining coincident root loci. Preprint.
- [5] J. Chipalkatti. A generalization of Castelnuovo regularity to Grassmann varieties. *Manuscripta Math.*, vol. 102, pp. 447–464, 2000.
- [6] I. Dolgachev and V. Kanev. Polar covariants of cubics and quartics. *Adv. in Math.*, vol. 98, no. 2, pp. 216–301, 1993.
- [7] W. Fulton. *Young Tableaux*. London Mathematical Society Student Texts. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997.
- [8] W. Fulton and J. Harris. *Representation Theory, A First Course*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer–Verlag, New York, 1991.
- [9] I. M. Gelfand, M. M. Kapranov, and A. V. Zelevinsky. *Discriminants, Resultants and Multidimensional Determinants*. Birkhäuser, Boston., 1994.
- [10] J. H. Grace and A. Young. The algebra of invariants, 1903. Reprinted by Chelsea, New York in 1982.
- [11] M. Green. Koszul cohomology and the geometry of projective varieties, II. *J. Diff. Geometry*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 279–289, 1984.
- [12] J. Harris. *Algebraic Geometry, A First Course*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer–Verlag, New York, 1992.
- [13] R. Hartshorne. *Algebraic Geometry*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer–Verlag, New York, 1977.
- [14] H. Kraft. *Geometrische Methoden in der Invariantentheorie*. Aspekte der Mathematik. Vieweg, Braunschweig, 1985.
- [15] I. G. MacDonald. *Symmetric Functions and Hall Polynomials*. Oxford University Press, 2nd edition, 1995.
- [16] P. Olver. *Classical Invariant Theory*. London Mathematical Society Student Texts. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999.
- [17] O. Porras. Rank varieties and their resolutions. *J. of Algebra*, vol. 186, no. 3, pp. 677–723, 1996.
- [18] G. Salmon. Higher algebra, 5th ed., 1876. Reprinted by Chelsea, New York in 1964.
- [19] G. Salmon. Higher plane curves, 3rd ed., 1879. Reprinted by Chelsea, New York in 1960.
- [20] B. Sturmfels. *Algorithms in Invariant Theory*. Texts and Monographs in Symbolic Computation. Springer–Verlag, Wien–New York, 1993.
- [21] H. Weitzenböck. *Invarianten-Theorie*. Noordhoff, 1923.
- [22] H. Weyl. *Classical Groups. Their Invariants and Representations*. Princeton Univ. Press, 1939.

Jaydeep V. Chipalkatti
Department of Mathematics and Statistics,
416 Jeffery Hall, Queen's University,
Kingston, ON K7L 3N6, Canada.
email: jaydeep@mast.queensu.ca